

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not discuss the local meteorology nor the prevalence of the Thermal Internal Boundary Layer (TIBL) and inversion during a major part of each year. This is important because the presence of inversion and the TIBL will affect dispersion models that predict when and how airborne emissions will be dispersed. This EIS needs to discuss these issues in full detail, including identifying the models chosen to support the descriptions given and how these will adequately describe the potential impacts, past and present, of routine operations.

The EIS does not discuss past episodes when it was reported that people and/or animals were adversely affected by airborne emissions resulting from activity at the Bruce site. This EIS takes both a precautionary and a sustainable approach and asserts that a best practices management policy is present throughout. As such, it needs to identify why and how these reports of local stakeholders do not accurately describe adverse effects from the routine and necessary support operations at the site.

In 2002, airborne emissions from the fire training field descended on our home and made everyone present ill. My staff and I met with a Bruce Power team led by Ross Lamont to devise a protocol for fire training activity that avoided certain meteorological periods. There were no further events here until Bruce Power unilaterally and without notice to us abandoned this protocol in 2007. Why did it do so and what empirical evidence is there that demonstrates these airborne emissions did not cause the symptoms that have been reported by local stakeholders as a result of this exposure?

The EIS for the Newbuild project indicates that each station requires 14 such fire training activities annually. That is 3 times as often as in 2006. As the rebuilt units of Bruce A returned to service, these employees would have required fire training and this increased activity may have accounted for why our property was impacted twice in 2007 and not at all between 2002 and 2007. With 3 times the activity, it is possible that no property below the escarpment is safe from these emissions, including the Municipal children's bike park that is built in a direct line with emission streams present when the above events occurred. How does Bruce Power intend to operate the fire training facility in such a way as to ensure stakeholders are not adversely affected?